

[Date notice sent to all parties]: April 21, 2015

IRO CASE #:

DESCRIPTION OF THE SERVICE OR SERVICES IN DISPUTE:

Request: outpatient arthroscopy, subchondral plasty for left knee

A DESCRIPTION OF THE QUALIFICATIONS FOR EACH PHYSICIAN OR OTHER HEALTH CARE PROVIDER WHO REVIEWED THE DECISION:

The physician performing this review is Board Certified, American Board of Orthopedic Surgery. The physician has been in practice since 1998 and is licensed in Texas, Oklahoma, Minnesota and South Dakota.

REVIEW OUTCOME:

Upon independent review, the reviewer finds that the previous adverse determination/adverse determinations should be:

- ☒ Upheld (Agree)
- ☐ Overturned (Disagree)
- ☐ Partially Overturned (Agree in part/Disagree in part)

Provide a description of the review outcome that clearly states whether medical necessity exists for each of the health care services in dispute.

Upon independent review the physician finds that the previous adverse determination should be ~ Upheld

PATIENT CLINICAL HISTORY [SUMMARY]:

Patient is a male with injury suffered on xx/xx/xx when he inadvertently stepped in a hole. He initially was diagnosed with a left knee subsequent MRI indicated a torn meniscus. underwent arthroscopic meniscectomy with chondroplasty and partial anterior cruciate ligament debridement on 09/17/14.

Unfortunately, continued to have pain subsequent to the surgery, and attempts at corticosteroid injections as well as viscosupplementation injections were offered. Previous treatments have included anti-inflammatory medications as well as physical therapy.

ANALYSIS AND EXPLANATION OF THE DECISION INCLUDE CLINICAL BASIS, FINDINGS, AND CONCLUSIONS USED TO SUPPORT THE DECISION:

Upon independent review, I find the previous adverse determinations should be upheld. ODG evidence-based guidelines were used and are quite clear in stating that subchondroplasty is “not recommended.”

Additionally, arthroscopy has been previously performed for meniscectomy, and ODG guidelines also state that arthroscopic surgery for osteoarthritis is “not recommended.”

A DESCRIPTION AND THE SOURCE OF THE SCREENING CRITERIA OR OTHER CLINICAL BASIS USED TO MAKE THE DECISION:

- ☐ ACOEM- AMERICAN COLLEGE OF OCCUPATIONAL & ENVIRONMENTAL MEDICINE UM KNOWLEDGEBASE
- ☐ AHCPR- AGENCY FOR HEALTHCARE RESEARCH & QUALITY GUIDELINES
- ☐ DWC- DIVISION OF WORKERS COMPENSATION POLICIES OR GUIDELINES
- ☐ EUROPEAN GUIDELINES FOR MANAGEMENT OF CHRONIC LOW BACK PAIN
- ☐ INTERQUAL CRITERIA
- ☐ MEDICAL JUDGEMENT, CLINICAL EXPERIENCE, AND EXPERTISE IN ACCORDANCE WITH ACCEPTED MEDICAL STANDARDS
- ☐ MERCY CENTER CONSENSUS CONFERENCE GUIDELINES
- ☐ MILLIMAN CARE GUIDELINES
- ☒ ODG- OFFICIAL DISABILITY GUIDELINES & TREATMENT GUIDELINES
- ☐ PRESSLEY REED, THE MEDICAL DISABILITY ADVISOR
- ☐ TEXAS GUIDELINES FOR CHIROPRACTIC QUALITY ASSURANCE & PRACTICE PARAMETERS
- ☐ TEXAS TACADA GUIDELINES
- ☐ TMF SCREENING CRITERIA MANUAL
- ☐ PEER REVIEWED NATIONALLY ACCEPTED MEDICAL LITERATURE (PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION)
- ☐ OTHER EVIDENCE BASED, SCIENTIFICALLY VALID, OUTCOME FOCUSED GUIDELINES (PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION)